

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/501,621	02/09/2000	Randell L. Mills	8AC4-DIVI	4145	
20736	7590 02/22/2002				
MANELLI DENISON & SELTER			EXAMINER		
2000 M STREET NW SUITE 700 WASHINGTON, DC 20036-3307			LANGEL, V	LANGEL, WAYNE A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1754	1,8	
			DATE MAILED: 02/22/2002		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Advisory Action	09/50/62/ MILLS			
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	T	
	Wayne Langel	1754		
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence add	iress	
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of App Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	o avoid abandonment of the (1) a timely filed amendroeal (with appeal fee); or (nent which places the appli	ply to a cation in	
PERIOD FOR F	REPLY (check either a) or	· b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	-			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA 706.07(f).	than SIX MONTHS from the mai AS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTH	iling date of the final rejection. HS OF THE FINAL REJECTION.	See MPEP	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The chave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the period of extension (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three rearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding am ned statutory period for reply origir months after the mailing date of th	nount of the fee. The appropriate ex nally set in the final Office action; or the final rejection, even if timely filed,	tension fee under (2) as set forth in , may reduce any	
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on $\frac{2-6-3}{37}$	- opellant's Brief must be fil FR 1.191(d)), to avoid dis	led within the period set for smissal of the appeal.	th in	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered				
(a) they raise new issues that would require furt	ther consideration and/or	search (see NOTE below):		
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	n in better form for appea	l by materially reducing or s	simplifying the	
(d) they present additional claims without cance	eling a corresponding nur	mber of finally rejected clair	ms.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje	ection(s):			
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	ld be allowable if submitte	ed in a separate, timely filed	d amendment	
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request f application in condition for allowance because: S		een considered but does NC	OT place the	
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed S	SOLELY to issues which we	re newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims v			and an	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	s:			
Claim(s) allowed:	·			
		o.		
Claim(s) objected to:		•		

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-303 (Rev. 04-01)

10. Other: ____

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's request for reconsideration has been considered but is deemed unpersuasive for the reasons of record in the final rejection mailed 7/6/01. Applicant argues that the examiner has not fully and fairly considered the experimental evidence presented. However, this is not persuasive because the experimental evidence submitted was fully evaluated as set forth in the attachment to the final rejection. The various other remarks presented by the applicant in response to the final rejection have also been considered but appear to be merely a restatement of previously presented remarks and arguments which were addressed in the prior office action to which applicant is directed for specifics relating thereto.

Wayne A. Langel Wayne A. Langel Primary Examiner GAU 1754